

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The present Amendment is responsive to the non-final Office Action mailed September 19, 2007, in the above-identified application.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 9-11, 15, 19 and 20 are the claims currently pending in the present application.

Claims 1 and 2 are amended to clarify features recited thereby.

Applicant's Statement of Substance of Interview

Applicant thanks the Examiner and the Supervisory Examiner for the opportunity of a telephone interview conducted on consecutive days October 23 and October 24, 2007. During the interview, Applicant's representative pointed out that the cited references do not disclose or suggest a self-regulating pressure regulator as recited in claim 1 and as described in Applicant's disclosure (see, for example, Specification, page 6, lines 16-24). For example, as made clear in Applicant's previous Amendment, page 5, the self-regulating pressure regulator requires no feedback of the direct pressure provided from the liquid that is being dispensed from the flexible bag. It provides pressure at a constant and predetermined level. Applicant's representative suggested amending claim 1 to clarify the self-regulating feature. The Examiners acknowledged that such an amendment of claim 1 would seem to overcome the cited references. The foregoing will serve as Applicant's statement of the substance of the Examiner interview.

Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 10, 11, 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 10, 11, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Laing, CA 2,083,555. Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 requires a pressure regulator positioned between the source of gas and the flexible bag and configured to self-regulate the pressure applied to the exterior walls of the bag at a constant and predetermined level, the pressure regulator self-regulating without direct pressure feedback from the liquid being dispensed from the flexible bag.

Laing discloses an isolation device 60 enclosed in an impermeable member sock 65 as part of the line 46 which receives pressure feedback from the outlet 45 of the flexible container for

medication 40, which feedback is then provided to the air bag 30 inside the compact rigid housing 20 to regulate the pressure provided.

Laing does not disclose or suggest a pressure regulator self-regulating without direct pressure feedback from the liquid being dispensed from the flexible bag, as required by claim 1. Accordingly, Laing does not disclose or suggest the recitations of independent claim 1.

Claims 2, 4, 7, 10, 11, 19 and 20 depend from claim 1 and therefore are patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the same reasons.

Rejection of Claims 9 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 9 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious from Laing in view of Keime, GB 2,165,312. Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 requires a pressure regulator positioned between the source of gas and the flexible bag and configured to self-regulate the pressure applied to the exterior walls of the bag at a constant and predetermined level, the pressure regulator self-regulating without direct pressure feedback from the liquid being dispensed from the flexible bag.

Keime discloses a manually operable pressure injector in which, after a needle is introduced into the patient, the operator builds up pressure by acting on a regulator to a point beyond the chosen pressure by operating the flow regulator 23 for manual control of the flow of gas into the casing 1 (Keime, page 2, lines 76-85). The operator continually consults the pressure gauge 17 on the face of casing 1, which indicates the pressure obtaining in the inner space (Keime, page 2, lines 20-22). When pressure approximately 10 millibars beyond the desired or chosen pressure is obtained, the pressure is eased off and stabilized at the final level by the operator and, if the desired pressure is accidentally overshoot, the operator may operate the decompression valve 11 to readjust the pressure (Keime, page 2, lines 82-90).

Keime does not disclose or suggest a pressure regulator that self-regulates without direct pressure feedback from the liquid being dispensed from the flexible bag, as required by claim 1. As discussed, a human operator operates the flow regulator 23 to control the pressure level, and thus the device is not self-regulating. Further, the pressure is regulated to a level above the

desired pressure level and then brought down and thus the pressure is not maintained “at a constant and predetermined level” throughout the duration of the dispensing, as further required by claim 1. Accordingly, even taken together in combination, Keime and Laing do not disclose or suggest the recitations of claim 1. Therefore, since claims 9 and 15 depend from claim 1, they are patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the same reasons.

In view of the foregoing discussion, withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING
SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY
THROUGH THE UNITED STATES
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
EFS FILING SYSTEM
ON **FEBRUARY 19, 2008**

RCF:GB:ns

Respectfully submitted,



Robert C. Faber
Registration No.: 24,322
OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP
1180 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-8403
Telephone: (212) 382-0700